



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

TIMOTHY W. ARTHUR,
Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; U.S.
PROBATION OFFICE; RICHLAND
COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT; P.O.
BRYANT SOWELL, *Fed Probation*
Officer; and FEDERAL B.O.P.,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 3:24-4959-MGL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,
SUMMARILY DISMISSING THIS CASE WITH PREJUDICE, WITHOUT LEAVE TO
AMEND, AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**

Plaintiff Timothy W. Arthur (Arthur), who is representing himself, filed this action against the above-named Defendants, alleging claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and *Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court dismiss this case without leave to amend and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court

may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on November 4, 2024. To date, Arthur has failed to file any objections.

“[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this case is summarily **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**, without leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 25th day of November 2024, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Arthur is hereby notified of his right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.